

Application No.: 10/687329Case No.: 59093US002**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the mechanical locking means (claim 5) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Applicants hereby cancel claim 5.

Application No.: 10/687329

Case No.: 59093US002

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 15 are pending. Claims 1 to 15 are rejected. Claim 1 is hereby amended.
Claim 5 is cancelled.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunin et al. (5,923,803).

The Office Action essentially states:

Bunin et al., figure 4, disclose an optical interconnect device comprising:

- . a fiber optic cable (20) having two ends and comprising at least one optical fiber (22) surrounded by a protective jacket where the diameter of the fiber optic cable is larger than the diameter of the optical fiber and where the protective jacket at least a first end of the fiber optic cable has been removed thereby exposing the optical fibers;

- . a ribbonized assembly (31) encasing a portion of the first end of the fiber optic cable and the optical fibers, where the optical fibers in the ribbonized assembly lie parallel to one another and has a first pitch; and

- . a ferrule (50) attached to the ribbonized assembly, the ferrule having a plurality of internal grooves (54) having a second pitch;

wherein the first pitch of the optical fiber is substantially equal to the second pitch of the ferrule.

Bunin et al. disclose the instant claimed invention as described above except for a plurality of fiber optic cables.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to separate Bunin et al.'s cable to have a plurality of fiber optic cables, since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPQ 177, 179, in order to reduce cost and easy assembly.

Regarding claim 2, the optical fibers in the ribbonized assembly are nearly touching one another.

Regarding claim 3, the ribbonized assembly is of a geometry that will not violate the minimum bend radius of the optical fiber.

Regarding claim 4, the fiber optic cable is a tight buffer fiber cable.

Regarding claim 5, the ribbonized assembly comprising mechanical locking means.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, the ribbonized assembly comprising an ultraviolet light curable resin and non-active fibers disposed adjacent to the optical fibers.

Regarding claims 8-10, the non-active fibers are of the same construction as the optical fibers, the optical fibers are disposed between the non-active fibers.

Regarding claim 11, the protective jacket on both ends of the fiber optic cable has been removed to expose the optical fibers.

Regarding claim 12, the ferrule is terminated to a MT connector.

Regarding claims 13 and 14, the second end of the fiber optic cable is terminated to an optical device, the optical device is a simplex v-groove.

Regarding claim 15, the ribbonized assembly is straight.

Application No.: 10/687329

Case No.: 59093US002

Applicants respectfully submit that according to MPEP 2142, to establish a case of prima facie obviousness, three basic criteria must be met: 1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references or generally known to one skilled in the art, to modify or combine reference teachings, 2) there must be reasonable expectation of success, and 3) prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The ability to modify the method of the references is not sufficient. The reference(s) must provide a motivation or reason for making the changes. *Ex parte Chicago Rawhide Manufacturing Co.*, 226 USPQ 438 (PTO Bd. App. 1984).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitation that the fiber optic cable occupies an input zone, the fibers occupy an output zone, and the cable and fibers both occupy a transition zone in which the fibers are non-parallel. The amendment is supported by the specification, e.g., at p. 6, lines 2-7, p. 7, lines 18-20 and Figs. 3, 4, 7, and 8.

Applicants respectfully submit that the references cannot support a case of prima facie obviousness as to the claims because, among other possible reasons, the cited references do not provide a motivation or suggest for providing a transition zone occupied by the cable and fibers in which the fibers are non-parallel because Bunin teaches maintaining the fibers in parallel. See, e.g., Bunin, col. 4, lines 63-67 and co. 6, line 32-col. 7, line 10. In addition, the reference does not disclose all the elements of the present invention because it does not disclose a transition zone occupied by the cable and fibers in which the fibers are non-parallel.

For these reasons, Applicant(s) submit that the cited reference will not support a 103(a) rejection of the claimed invention and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition to the foregoing arguments, Applicant(s) submit that a dependent claim should be considered allowable when its parent claim is allowed. *In re McCairn*, 1012 USPQ 411 (CCPA 1954). Accordingly, provided the independent claims are allowed, all claims depending therefrom should also be allowed.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 is requested. Examination and reconsideration of the claims are requested. Allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited.

Application No.: 10/687329

Case No.: 59093US002

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant(s)' attorney if the Examiner believes any remaining questions or issued could be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

Jan 25, 2005
Date

By: Melanie Gover
Melanie G. Gover, Reg. No.: 41,793
Telephone No.: (512) 984-4308

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833